

It appears to me that beekeepers of this country are receiving tremendous opposition to their proposal which is going to be offset by additional hard legislative work on my part and other Congressmen, to be able to realize the enactment of this legislation. The mood of Congress at this time is not to disallow importations into this country of any product even though restrictions can be justified, as in the case of the beekeepers, whereby the importation of these products are causing serious economic results among honey producers.

Please be assured that I will continue to do everything in my power to cause the realization of this legislation, and I think the rightness of this legislation should have some merit as we proceed through the legislative channels of the House.

Editor's Note: Of course, this was written before the adjournment of the 90th Congress. This article points out clearly the tremendous opposition to this bill, which should emphasize the real need for honey producers to write their representatives urging them to support H.R. 10677.

THE NIXON FARM PROGRAM

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1968

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, beleaguered farmers and ranchers across the Nation can take fresh hope from the proposal to revitalize agriculture and rural America put forward by the Republican presidential candidate, Richard Nixon.

The Topeka, Kans., Capital-Journal, in its September 22 edition, editorialized on the major points of this proposal and emphasized why this type of new national farm policy is long overdue. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to direct the attention of Members on both sides of the aisle to this editorial, "The Nixon Farm Program":

THE NIXON FARM PROGRAM

Richard M. Nixon has spelled out some of the details of his farm program with some new policy lines, although specifications of fundamental changes he might make to improve the farm economy were not elaborated on in a statement he made in Des Moines.

The Republican presidential candidate said that present policies that have put farm prices at 74 per cent of parity are "intolerable." Parity is that principle by which the government supports prices to keep them at the level of past years in relation to the cost of other goods.

Farmers, Nixon said, must be able to prosper in relation to the prices they pay for other products. His statement was a sober and moderate one, reassuring farmers who dislike the restraints and results of some of the present federal programs but whose greater fear is sudden change. To this end, he pledged some of these major points:

Encouragement of farm cooperatives.

Use of Commodity Credit Corporation stores of grain and other goods "to improve prices, not depress them."

Improvement of the Food for Peace program and the supply of food to schools and the needy.

He said that his policy won't be "to junk everything in an impatience to reach the millennium overnight. We will not plow under farmers while trying to help them." He promised if elected, an open door for agriculture at the White House.

A Republican victory in November would bring a complete change of officeholders along with some new policies in the top U.S. agricultural command. Nixon has made no bones about sending Orville Freeman, secretary of agriculture, packing. He has pledged to appoint a successor who is "expert and practically experienced in agriculture."

The Republican has called Freeman a "politico-lawyer" and has termed his administration a sad and sorry record. Freeman, for his part, has indicated he will leave the job next January regardless of the November outcome.

A new national farm policy is long overdue. Farming suffers from inadequate income, rising costs and fewer opportunities for young rural Americans. In his first major farm policy statement Richard Nixon has shown he recognizes the need for a government farm program that will bring economic growth and development to rural America.

He has pledged to better preserve agriculture for service in the 1970s.

THE LESSON OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 25, 1968

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit for inclusion in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the September 1968 issue of Navy magazine.

The article discusses the Soviet takeover of Czechoslovakia by military force and emphasizes that the invasion is a grim reminder that Kremlin policy when it comes to advancing communism is as brutal and unyielding as ever. It points out that we must continue to be adequately prepared to deal with the Soviet threat.

The editorial, entitled "The Lesson of Czechoslovakia," follows:

THE LESSON OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

The second Soviet rape of Czechoslovakia in 20 years should open the eyes of all Americans to the unpleasant fact that brutal military force is still the controlling factor in this imperfect world. Many influential citizens who help mold American thinking had become convinced that the Communists "had changed." They argued that Russian leaders had mellowed, were moving toward individual freedom and responsible conduct and that therefore it was safe for the United States to curtail its defenses and take "risks for peace" vis-a-vis Moscow on arms curbs and Hanoi in the Paris negotiations. Set an example by stopping work on plans to match Soviet construction of more advanced sea and land based strategic missiles, a missile defense system, and more and greatly improved attack submarines and the newly reasonable Communist leadership would follow suit, it was stated. Stop all bombing of North Viet Nam and make the other concessions demanded by Hanoi and we could end the war "honorably." President Johnson—to his great credit—disregarded this advice. But he took the unprecedented step of cutting defense forces in the middle of a war to meet a congressionally-imposed \$6 billion reduction in the budget.

Many of those who argued for what essentially was unilateral disarmament and throwing in the sponge in Southeast Asia now maintain that the 1968 Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia somehow was different than that of 1948, or of their bloody suppression of

a similar movement toward freedom in Hungary in 1956. Fear rather than greed motivated the Russians this time, these Americans contend. The Russians will lose more than they gained in the long run by the alienation of world "public opinion" and weakening of Communist parties in free and neutralist nations, it is said. These leaders also choose to ignore the earlier parallel of the 1938 rape of Czechoslovakia by Hitler and its consequences.

A TIMELY REMINDER

We well remember, however, what followed the 1938 action and that in 1948. The Soviet occupation and takeover of Czechoslovakia 20 years ago alerted the free world to the dangers of Soviet imperialism and resulted in an expanded American defense program and the formation of NATO. The Western reaction this time has been slow. The Administration still seems pressing for a summit meeting on nuclear arms curbs—an important and eminently desirable end under proper safeguards. But at this writing, the deactivation of 50 badly needed warships and eight naval air squadrons was going forward. Defense Secretary Clark M. Clifford's June stoppage of work on the "silent submarine" still stood. The formation of a new Army division had been stopped and cuts in Air Force tactical air power were still a fact.

Perhaps there are some differences between today and the earlier invasions of Czechoslovakia and Hungary. Czech leaders have elected to go along with the occupation with subtle rather than outright resistance, which would have brought even more bloodshed in Prague. But the central fact remains that the Kremlin resorted to stark naked force to accomplish its aims and we should sadly realize that the cold war is still with us.

Equally important, we should face up fully to highly significant Soviet actions in other fields. There is rather clear evidence that the Russians have test fired a MIRV—multiple, independently-targeted reentry vehicle—which is particularly threatening because their large boosters are capable of launching much larger warheads than those of the United States. And most noteworthy is the quiet but rapid expansion of Soviet sea power, not only toward achievement of an offensive fleet by construction of nuclear missile submarines, surface missile warships and the world's greatest merchant marine, but by their entry into the Mediterranean, the North Atlantic and the Indian Ocean.

"MARGINAL" READINESS

What should we do about all this? First, the Administration and Congress should act swiftly to stop the cuts in operating forces of all the services. It is very foolhardy to so weaken the U.S. Fleet's antisubmarine and other forces in light of the ever-growing Soviet submarine threat. The cut in 50 ships was generally described as involving old warcraft, but actually some of the destroyer-types were built in the 1950's. And the other ships are still needed and serviceable.

A recent report of an in-depth investigation by a House Armed Services Subcommittee headed by Rep. Porter Hardy, Jr. (D-Va.), moreover, concluded that the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean was in a condition of "marginal" readiness. Due in large part to the work of Defense Department "cost effectiveness" experts, the Seventh Fleet is short on skilled pilots and modern aircraft.

The Navy and other armed forces need additional operation and maintenance funds, new aircraft, ships and weapons, and additional personnel and training funds to beef up undermanned units in other areas than Viet Nam. Clifford should give the go-ahead signal on the quiet submarine, and the new budget—indeed a supplemental budget—should provide considerably more money for research and development. This is particularly true of development of new hull designs, such as the catamaran becoming so

popular among pleasure boatmen, to give destroyer-types greater stability and space. We have been spending billions in past years loading up our warships with vitally-needed new weapons, but starving development of new warship hulls. The same thing is true of surface ship propulsion, where only peanuts is provided for development of such things as captured air bubble propulsion and super-cavitating propellers.

Equally important is action toward rebuilding the Nation's sadly deficient merchant marine.

Finally, the Administration should embrace the recommendation in the Republican Party's platform calling for a select committee of prominent citizens, including scientists and military leaders, to review American military policy. We think such a study would conclude that an ocean-oriented strategy for the United States, as called for by the Navy League of the United States, is required.

As Secretary Clifford told the National Press Club early this month, "Our hopes for the future, as well as the lessons of the past, suggest that the rock of power must be the foundation for the house of peace."

FINANCIAL PLIGHT OF RETIRED GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 25, 1968

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, testimony presented July 29, 1968, to the Human Needs Subcommittee of the Republican National Convention's Platform Committee by Mr. Thomas G. Walters, president of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees, brings to light a matter of great concern to me. I feel that my colleagues in the House of Representatives should be made aware of the grave financial plight suffered by a majority of the retirees of our own Federal Government, so ably pointed out in Mr. Walters' statement.

Since there are in my own State of Maryland, more than 32,000 retired Federal employees and their survivors, I have always been keenly interested in their welfare. There are approximately 800,000 of these annuitants and survivor annuitants in the entire country, and it is shocking to note from Mr. Walters' testimony, the great number of these retired civil servants who are now living on incomes well below the \$3,000 per annum poverty level. If our Federal Government is to be a model employer, it is imperative that such conditions be eradicated.

After long and dedicated careers in the service of our Government it is unthinkable that these annuitants should have to spend their retirement years in virtual poverty. We have an obligation to these people which has not been fulfilled in the past, but which must be met in the very near future, if we are to make Federal service an attractive and honorable career, and the Federal Government a just and honest employer.

I insert in the RECORD, Mr. Walters' testimony and hope that the statistics contained therein will awaken all of us to the serious problem which now exists among the Federal annuitants and survi-

vor annuitants of this country. The problem must be realized and it must be dealt with now. The testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF THOMAS G. WALTERS, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED CIVIL EMPLOYEES, BEFORE THE PLATFORM COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN NEEDS, SENATOR HUGH SCOTT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, CHAIRMAN, REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION, MIAMI BEACH, FLA., MONDAY, JULY 29, 1968

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

My name is Thomas G. Walters, President of the National Association of Retired Civil Employees, an organization with over 134,000 members representing the interests of more than 800,000 annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement System, as retired Federal employees or survivors of deceased employees and retirees. While we are primarily concerned with the problems of those receiving civil service retirement annuities, we also take particular interest in the problems, welfare and status of all the aged and aging in our Nation.

Thanks to the progress of medical science, people are living longer now than ever before, and the percentage of persons over 65 years of age has grown to almost 10 percent of the population of our country. By now, it is probable that the total number of older Americans (over 65 years of age) has passed 20 million.

Thousands upon thousands of these people have basic living problems. Many of them must live on meager incomes, far less than the yearly minimum of \$3,000 per couple believed to be necessary to escape poverty. Although Medicare provisions have aided in the solution of health problems, many of them still lack the means to secure medical care necessary to prolong life. Many of them have inadequate housing.

Our association is interested in every proposal to help these older Americans. We believe that those who served so well should now have the means to live in comfort and security and that medical aid should be provided when it is necessary. We cannot pay our debt to them but we should do something for these people in need.

Our members are retired Federal employees and survivors with the same problems as other older Americans. Of an approximate 800,000 retired civil employees and their survivors, some 279,000 receive a monthly annuity of less than \$100 and 513,000 receive less than \$200 per month. Using a poverty level income of \$3,000 per year, 611,000 plus former Federal employees and their survivors are now living in poverty, with 220,000 of them having yearly annuity incomes of over \$3,000.

Although the Medicare provisions are helpful to many older Americans, not all Federal retirees and their dependents are eligible for full Medicare coverage, an omission in the Medicare Law which we feel is unjust.

Some of our members retired a number of years ago when salaries were much lower and the retirement formula was less favorable. Although their meager annuities have been supplemented by occasional increases, a majority of these increases have been based on, and aided only in, meeting the continually rising cost-of-living. Recent increases for persons covered by Social Security, Railroad Retirement, and with minimum annuity increases for those under Social Security, have not been extended to persons covered under the Civil Service Retirement System.

The 1967 Comparability Pay Law recognized the need for Federal salaries to be comparable with those in private industry, but it did not extend an increase to Federal retirees. At the present time, with the aid of Social Security, many private industries are more liberal in providing benefits for their former employees than our own Government.

Thousands of our Federal retirees who were predeceased by their spouse must continue to take a reduction in their annuities, and if they remarry their second spouse cannot be named as a survivor annuitant. Also many retirees and survivors are penalized by reductions in their annuities and excluded from liberalizing benefits due to the fact that the liberalized benefits go only to employees retiring after the date of the amendment's enactment.

Federal income tax exemptions are more liberal for Social Security and Railroad Retirement beneficiaries than for Civil Service annuitants. These are all examples of inequities existing against former employees of our Federal Government. These men and women have given their loyal and devoted service as Civil Servants and we think that the United States should set an example with respect to treatment of the older Americans who grew old in the service of our great Government.

We urge this panel and the Committee to recommend, and the Convention to adopt, a declaration in the 1968 Republican platform, basically as follows:

"As an example to all employers, public and private, that it is not only wise but just, to provide comfort and security in their declining years to those who have rendered dedicated service during their careers we favor a retirement system for Federal civilian employees and dependents under which benefits are adequate and are equalized as nearly as practicable for all beneficiaries, according to the length and character of service rendered; and in keeping with today's living standards, those retirees receiving total incomes of less than \$3,000 per year be made eligible for welfare, medical aid and surplus commodities as other citizens in similar circumstances."

WHERE DO WE STAND?

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 25, 1968

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, the National Association of Government Employees held its annual national convention at the Hotel Chamberlain, Fort Monroe, Va.

The keynote speaker was the Honorable L. J. Andolsek, Vice Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

Mr. Andolsek delivered an excellent speech in which he outlined some of the progressive steps being taken by the U.S. Civil Service Commission and some of the problems facing that great agency.

I think his remarks will be interesting to my colleagues and under unanimous consent I include his speech in the RECORD:

WHERE DO WE STAND?

(By Commissioner L. J. Andolsek, U.S. Civil Service Commission)

President Ken Lyons, national officers, delegates, Congressman and Mrs. Downing, and guests, I bring you greetings and best wishes from Chairman John Macy and Commissioner Bob Hampton, my associates on the Civil Service Commission.

In these nervous days of protest and disagreement . . . of riots and marches . . . I think it might be instructive if you will let me take you back in history about 70 years—give or take a few.

During the years of the great immigration from Europe to this country, there were large groups of people who were discontented.